

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION**

CRAIG CUNNINGHAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

JP3 ENTERPRISES, LLC D/B/A MY
VEHICLE PROTECTION, ET AL.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:19-CV-00902-ALM-
CAN

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Plaintiff Craig Cunningham's ("Plaintiff") "Motion for a Court Order Directing Verizon to Produce the Subscriber Information as Requested in the Subpoena" ("Motion for Court Order") [Dkt. 42] and "Motion for Sanctions and a Finding of Contempt" ("Motion for Sanctions") [Dkt. 43]. In Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order, Plaintiff fails to provide a copy of the subpoena. Additionally, it appears Verizon may not have been served with a copy of Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order. The Court, on the present record, is unable to determine whether Plaintiff complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45, Verizon is aware of Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order, and/or if the Court is the proper court to consider the instant Motion for Court Order. For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order and Motion for Sanctions should each be denied without prejudice. Accordingly,

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order [Dkt. 42] and Motion for Sanctions [Dkt. 43] are each **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 12th day of May, 2020.

